

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 19, 2004. Claims 1-4, 16 and 17 are currently pending in the present application. Additionally, as indicated above, Claims 1, 16, and 17 have been amended.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-4, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by *Yegani et al.* (WO 00/11879). However, as indicated above, independent Claims 1, 16 and 17 have been amended to further describe how the PACA service is distinguished from the ordinary call service, i.e., by charging a subscriber based on a PACA reorigination indicator included in the new origination message.

More specifically, referring to page 10, lines 4-8 of the present application, “[a]fter the MS 100 has been completed communication, the MSC 130 distinguishes the PACA call service from the ordinary call service in charging the subscriber based on the PCA reorigination indicator PACA_REORIG (PACA_REORIG indicator) contained in the reorigination message.”

However, referring to *Yegani*, “[o]ther subscribers may pay a premium for high priority access to the cellular system” (See page 4, lines 25-26). As for a parameter of *Yegani* corresponding to the PACA reorigination indicator (PACA_REORIG), included in the reorigination message of the present application, *Yegani* discloses “[i]f the PACA_REORIG data field has a value of “0”, the mobile switching center MSC knows that the PACA call origination came from the mobile station and is a new call” (See page 16, lines 25-27).

Therefore, comparing the present application, as recited in independent Claims 1, 16, and 17, with *Yegani*, the two disclosures are somewhat similar in that both of them provide PACA call service, and the ordinary call and PACA call can be distinguished. However, it is respectfully submitted that in independent Claims 1, 16, and 17, a distinguishable charging is performed using

the PACA reorigination indicator (PACA_REORIG) at the MSC, whereas *Yegani* discloses only that a premium may be paid for high priority access to the cellular system, without disclosure of the distinguishable account of the present invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 16, and 17 are patentably distinct from *Yegani*, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn.

As independent Claims 1, 16, and 17 are now believed to be in condition for allowance, it is respectfully submitted that dependent Claims 2-4 are also in condition for allowance as being dependent upon independent Claim 1.

In view of the preceding remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims, namely Claims 1-4, 16 and 17, are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Registration No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
(516) 228-8484

PJF/DMO/las